



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/730,034	12/04/2000	Alex D. Poon	3801.P011	6836

7590 10/19/2004

Marina Portnova
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
7th Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025

EXAMINER

THOMPSON, MARC D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2144

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/730,034

Applicant(s)

POON, ALEX D.

Examiner

Marc D. Thompson

Art Unit

2144

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 June 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4/15/02.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This application has been reassigned to a new Examiner. See Conclusion section below, for new Examiner contact information.
2. The response received 6/24/2004 has been entered into record.
3. Claims 1-27 are now pending.

Priority

4. The present application claims priority to provisional application 60/168,842.
5. The effective filing date for the subject matter defined in the pending claims in this application is 12/3/1999.

Drawings

6. The Examiner contends that the drawings submitted on 2/12/2001 are acceptable for examination proceedings.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in-

(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or

(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

8. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by French et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,263,447), hereinafter referred to as French.
9. French disclosed the invention precisely as claimed.

a. As per claim 1, French taught a method for facilitating user registration in a network-based transaction facility, the method comprising: identifying the user associated with a registration process within the network-based transaction facility (French; Abstract and Column 6, Lines 14-24), assigning a verification rating to the user based on accuracy of registration information submitted by the user during the registration process (French; Column 7, Lines 4-12 and Column 11, Line 28 through Column 12, Line 29), the Examiner interprets the "authenticity certainty score" as the "verification rating") and registering the user with the network-based transaction facility if the verification rating exceeds a predetermined threshold (French; Column 12, Lines 25-29 and Column 14, Lines 25-31).

b. As per claim 2, French taught wherein assigning the verification rating further comprises: performing a set of validity checks on the registration information of the user (French; Column 7, Line 46 through Column 11, Line 27), determining a result of each validity check within the set of validity checks (French; Column 7, Line 46 through Column 11, Line 27, and Column 12, Lines 30-37), and calculating the verification rating based on the result of each validity check (French; Column 11, Line 28 through Column 12, Line 29).

c. As per claim 3, French taught wherein each validity check verifies validity of a corresponding piece of the registration information of the user (French; Column 7, Line 46 through Column 11, Line 37).

d. As per claim 4, French taught utilizing a set of verification rules to define the set of validity checks, and translating the result of each validity check into a

numerical value (French; Column 2, Lines 48-56 and Column 12, Lines 14-29).

e. As per claim 5, French taught creating a verification detail record using the result of each validity check; and storing the verification record in a database (French; Figures 13-16 and Column 5, Line 66 through Column 6, Line 9).

f. As per claim 6, French taught storing the verification rating of the user in a database (French; Figures 13-16 and Column 5, Line 66 through Column 6, Line 9).

g. As per claims 7 and 8, French taught wherein the registration information comprises demographic information of the user and maintaining a database of valid demographic information and determining whether demographic information entered by the user matches any of the valid demographic information from the database (French; Table 1 and Column 11, Lines 38-51).

h. As per claims 9 and 10, French taught wherein the valid demographic information defines correlation between a plurality of area codes and a plurality of location information and wherein each of the plurality of location information includes any one of the group comprising country information, zip code information, state information, city information, time zone information, latitude information, and longitude information (French; Column 7, Lines 58-64 and Column 11, Lines 38-51).

i. As per claim 11, French taught wherein the valid demographic information defines correlation between a plurality of area codes and a plurality of location information (French; Column 11, Lines 38-51).

j. As per claim 12, French taught providing user interface information to the user via a communications network the user interface information specifying a

registration interface for obtaining registration of the user (French; Column 5, Lines 33-43 and Column 6, Lines 13-34).

10. As per Applicants statements in the response (Page 9, Response, received 6/24/2004), claims 13-27 do not teach above and beyond this base set of claims.

Response to Arguments

11. The arguments presented by Applicant in the response, received on 6/24/2004, are not considered persuasive. Applicant argues solely that the prior art of record, as applied, does not disclose allowing user(s) to conduct transactions with other users of the same network-based transaction facilities. Applicant attempts to distinguish the currently claimed invention from the applied prior art of record by characterizing French as describing a network authentication server that provides verification to other facilities for future transactions, further stating the other facilities avoid the need to authenticate the user. Applicant argues that French provided the use of the identity of a user being verified to enable the user to conduct transactions solely with users of other facilities.

12. This argument is not held to be persuasive, since minimally, French specifically recites in Column 5, Lines 51-65, that “authentication process (10) may be coresident on application server (130), obviating the need for authentication server (120).” This express statement provided that the “coresidency” of the authentication and application processes inherently provide authentication for services/applications specific to this particular “network-based transaction facility”.

13. Lastly, it is noted that simply because French taught authenticating user(s) for “network-based transaction facilities” other than the authentication facility, this does not preclude the

Art Unit: 2144

usage of the methodology set forth by French in the same “facility”. In reality, this “facility” was a network service domain, that is, a set of network resources which were accessible from the same network interface, optionally accessible through the same service interface, e.g., a single or correlated set of web pages. In short, if a user was authenticated for a remote site, this does not preclude authenticating the user for a local site.

Conclusion

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

15. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marc D. Thompson whose telephone number is 703-308-6750. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9am-4pm. Note: The Examiner expects to move to the new PTO site in Carlyle in the next few months, and contact information

Art Unit: 2144

will change at that time. If not available at the above number, The Examiner can be reached at 571-272-3932.

17. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Cuchlinski, Jr. can be reached on 703-308-3873. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

18. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MARC D. THOMPSON
MARC THOMPSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Marc D. Thompson
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2144